India

FOR THE

No. 184. New Series.]
No. 278. Old Series.]

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, JULY 12, 1901.

[Registered as a Newspaper. | Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 13
The Persistent Famine 16
Our London Letter 17
Indian Famines: Their Causes and Prevention.—I. By C. W. Whish 18
Chronicle of the Week 18
Letter to the Editor: "India in the Nineteenth Century" 20
British Democracy in India: Address by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji 20
The Famine in India 21
The Indian Famine Union... 21
The Statement of Moral and Material Progress: Some Opinions of the British Press 21
"Agricola Redivivus": Opinions of the Press on Mr. Thorburn's Paper 22
Indian Affairs in Parliament 23
Advertisements 24

NOTES AND NEWS.

THERE is one very hopeful sign at present in the Indian situation, and that is the general recognition from different sides of the need of detailed and careful enquiry. Sir William Wedderburn has for a long time urged the Government to undertake an exhaustive enquiry into the position of the peasantry in selected villages. Now also with the purpose of enquiry the Famine Union has been established in London, and it is instructive to find in the "Times of India" still another appeal for enquiry. This, indeed, proposes a different method. Starting from the "law" of Engel that the smaller the income (considered of course in relation to purchasing power) the larger the proportion spent in food, our contemporary suggests that an enquiry into the proportion of the Indian's income spent in food would form a true index to his poverty in comparison with that of the workers of other nations. The conditions of life in Europe and India are too dissimilar to make a comparison of the average income received by the workers in each of much use. The proportion spent on food in each case offers a firmer basis for inference.

Meanwhile, and pending such an investigation, the "Times of India" enters on an enquiry of its own by comparing wages and prices in Western India. The Annual Blue-book on prices and wages furnishes the data, and the result arrived at is not encouraging. The price of Jowar was twice as much in 1897 as in the period 1871-1875. 1897 was a famine year, but in 1898 the price was 31 per cent. over that of 1871-1875, and in 1899 39 per cent. over. In the price of Bajri there was also a considerable though not quite so great an increase; and Jowar and Bajri are the staple food of the people in Western India. On the other hand "the wages of able-bodied agricultural labour have practically remained stationary" since 1873. Thus we have rising prices and wages at a standstill.

The "Times of India" considers that the University of Research would be the best body to undertake such enquiries as it foreshadows; for it would be at once impartial and scientific. But failing that, it thinks that such investigations should be carried out by the Government, and it does not see "why a tactful and sympathetic officer should not succeed in enlisting the co-operation" of educated Indians, as in plague and famine relief. An enquiry so conducted would be "one more means of educating the public and the officials to work together for common ends." There is only one difficulty in the way of the realisation of this happy forecast. While Anglo-Indians and Indians thus vie with one another in demanding enquiry, the authorities at home still seem to shun the light. Our readers will not have forgotten how Sir William Wedderburn's motion for a village investigation was, in spite of the marked approval with which it was received, defeated by the pressure of the Government whips.

The last mail brings us the report of two meetings held to protest against the Land Revenue Code Amendment Bill. The first was at Satara under the presidency of Dr. Thatte. It was pointed out that the great burdens of the rayat, the heavy assessments and the rigidity of collection, were untouched. What the Bill did was to interfere with the ancient ownership of the rayats. The second meeting was at Bijapur under the presidency of Mr. Desai. It was described as a monster open-air meeting, and the appointment of a committee to send a memorial to the Government was unanimously resolved on.

Our readers will be sorry to learn from the letter which appears in another column that Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has withdrawn from the Famine Union rather than suffer its usefulness to be in any degree impaired by personal attacks, however unjustifiable, directed against himself. For our part we cannot help regretting Mr. Naoroji's decision, though we cordially appreciate the fine spirit which has dictated it. It is hard to believe that the Indian Famine Union would in any degree have been hindered in its work by any criticisms which malevolence might have suggested regarding wholly irrelevant matters, and it is just a question whether in such circumstances resignation does not give to factions and personal attacks an encouragement which it is not desirable that they should receive. However that may be, Mr. Naoroji has determined upon the course he will pursue, and his decision illustrates once more the temper of loyal self-effacement in which for so many years he has striven to promote the welfare of India. The criticisms which he evokes are but a tribute to his effectiveness. We hope that it may not be too late to induce him to re-consider his decision.

The Hon. Rai Bahadur P. Ananda Charlu delivered a most suggestive and useful address as President of the Provincial Conference at Madura on May 20 last. We agree strongly with him in regretting that these Provincial conferences have not been regularly held, and we hope that the popular interest will give the principle a fuller vitality in the future. We trust also that his hearers will take to heart his cogent remark "that the holding of congresses and conferences is not to be the be-all and end-all of our united exertions in India"; for there is the duty of "organising sundry institutions and machineries on a small scale to facilitate the task we cast on the Government, and to get the aid expected from it." It it somewhat difficult for us here to appreciate the difficulty he finds in organising District conferences—a difficulty which, he says, is "a purely prosaic matter-of-fact question of ways and means." Surely the expense can hardly prove a real obstacle, provided the spirit is there in any vital degree. Anyhow, there can be no doubt about the wisdom of "drawing towards each other in a living spirit of brotherhood, and amalgamating means and efforts, and uniting into one solid body to do its duty to the Provincial conference and the congress." Mr. Ananda Charlu added a counsel of far-reaching importance, which we are glad to reproduce in his own words. "Let them, above all," he said, "remember that in fulfilment of a duty 'it matters not,' as has been wisely said 'whether we be leaders in the forefront of the battle or only in the rank and file.'" On any other terms a movement is doomed to failure. And, we venture to say, the counsel is opportune as well as wise.

No less than ten of the resolutions moved at the conference were more or less connected with agriculture in one phase or another. After referring to the official interest and proposals on the subject, Mr. Ananda Charlu said it was "a duty of every delegate before him to leave broader questions for a time or for a higher platform, and to assist in that (official) enquiry by ascertaining and placing before the Government of India as many specific cases as he, his friends, and acquaintances, might lay their fingers on, as calling for attention and action." We need hardly say how thoroughly we appreciate such wise counsel to definite

practical action within the easy competence of every one of the delegates, or how much we should rejoice at seeing it carried into action. There is nothing that would so deeply impress officials with the practical capacity of the people. And, as Mr. Ananda Charlu said, "all this would be the easiest thing to do, if you parcel out your respective districts into such small areas as admit of being traversed or examined without much trouble or cost." Here is really a test case; and we wish there were some central agency to direct and supervise the action of individuals, so that the whole scheme may not evaporate in mere talk. The question of the Police, no doubt, involves "a Herculean task," and "a tremendous outlay of money," and must be left to be finally tackled "on a higher platform"; but for all that the conference may express local opinion and supply definite information which may prove very useful and effective on the higher platform, and meantime Mr. Ananda Charlu is quite right in thinking "that in the exercise of the disciplinary authority, possessed by the Governor in Council, much may be done to mitigate the evil or rather to lessen the chances of abuse of power." The whole address is well worth wide circulation and careful study.

It is a sign of the general discontent to which the police system everywhere gives rise at present that proposals for reform are to be found simultaneously in many and various places. Thus the subject is dealt with by the "Pioneer," the "Madras Mail," the "Tribune," and the "Englishman," among the journals that have arrived by the last mail. It cannot be said that any of these puts forward a completely satisfactory scheme, but from a study of each something may be gained, at least of the conditions of reform and of the causes of the present evil state. The "Pioneer," for instance, draws attention to the easy life of the country compared with the town policeman. Where possible, each man has an equal amount of town and country work, but in districts where towns are large and numerous this is impossible. Sometimes the policeman has to do four years in town to one year in the country; and while in the town he gets no better pay, he has to do duty night and day, and is almost continually in uniform. It is suggested that the town and mofussil police should be organised as separate forces, the former receiving a higher rate of pay.

A correspondent of the "Madras Mail" mentions a small but very obvious grievance of the police. Some forty years ago the batta allowed to constables was fixed at one anna per day. In those days as there were no eating-houses, and no Native hotels, villagers willingly gave a constable a meal for nothing. But with the establishment of eating-houses the policeman is naturally expected to go to them, and it is impossible to get even the poorest meal for less than two annas. The batta, therefore, should be increased to this amount at least. As it is, when a constable has to travel on escort or detective duty, he must begin by borrowing from the store-keeper, and often has to end by begging a meal. Borrowing at 50 per cent. is the sure way to increase corruption. The "Tribune," on the other hand, confines itself for the moment to a consideration of the Report of the Committee, which met to consider Police Administration in the Punjab, and declares that it has looked in vain therein "for a single really valuable suggestion."

In our "Chronicle of the Week"—a feature which we have revived at the request of many Indian readers—will be found some account of the Liberal party meeting that was held at the Reform Club on Tuesday. It may be pertinent to reproduce here some passages from the notable speech of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman:—

> Why, then, gentlemen, are we not united? With this community of view on the general question, which I believe in thoroughly, why are we still not united and not harmonious? Gentlemen, I think it my duty to speak plainly. We are divided, not on account of real and essential divergencies of opinion, but because of the operation of certain personal antagonisms which for the last half-dozen years have disturbed and paralysed the Liberal party in Parliament. In the interests of those antagonisms grounds of difference are eagerly sought out, the importance of smaller differences is exaggerated, and energies which ought to be political have been personal. (Hear, hear.) Our friends in the country know little or nothing of this. (Loud cheers.) . . . . Now, gentlemen, the Liberal party is a party of free speech and independent thought, of comprehensiveness, and of tolerance. (Hear, hear.) For my part, if it were not so I would not occupy a prominent position in it, nor even the humblest position in it. And I will not lend my authority to any exclusiveness—(hear, hear)—or to the repression of any genuine opinion. Differences of political opinion within a party are usually capable of being adjusted, and, even if they are not adjusted, they do not interfere with the general agreement. But in this case what I am speaking of does not represent genuine opinion; it manufactures differences for its own purpose. I am no partisan of any side in those antagonisms I speak of; they are confined to a few individuals, very honest, very energetic, and very persistent. They do not know the infinite mischief they do to the party which they imagine they serve. I impartially blame all who take part in them.

Sir Henry continued:—

> Well, gentlemen, I am here to say to you deliberately and emphatically that we shall never restore healthy efficiency to the Liberal party in the House of Commons unless these cabals are put down, and I appeal to all solid, earnest, loyal men—and I am sure I see no others here—to lend their aid in extinguishing them. I can make this appeal with the more frankness and confidence because I am not aware that these little machinations have ever been directed personally against myself. (Hear, hear.) Well, gentlemen, this evil can be put down by one force and by one force alone—by the general sense of the party, by all refusing to countenance any sectional organization which is directed against other members of the party, and declining to judge public questions by personal standards and prejudices. The party must, in fact, rise above those petty questions to a clear apprehension of the great part it is expected by its friends, and by the country at large, to fill. . . . . We have a noble mission to fulfil in enforcing the old Liberal doctrines which have made our country great and our people happy. Let us show ourselves worthy of that mission; and, if it in any degree fails to reach the full fruition of its purpose, let us see that it is not because of any paltry jealousies and schemings, which we, forsooth, had not the power or the will to overcome. (Hear, hear.) This is what I have to say to you to-day, gentlemen. I make this appeal to you against courses which I see more clearly every day that I live to be fatal to the efficiency of the party.

Wise words these—and have they not an application beyond the ranks of the Liberal party, and the limits of the United Kingdom?

Mr. J. M. Maclean, who was member for Oldham from 1885 to 1892, and for Cardiff from 1895-1900, is contributing to the "Manchester Guardian" a series of articles entitled "Personal Recollections of Life in the House of Commons." He begins (July 3) with "a short history of the preparation" he went through to fit him to become "an active member and an observant critic of the Imperial Parliament."

> I frequently see myself spoken of as a retired Anglo-Indian who, having made a little money after a long period of service in the East, suddenly took a plunge into English public life. But as a matter of fact I have only spent twelve out of sixty-five years in India, though I have given close and constant study for very many years to Indian affairs. I had a very good training in England before I went to India.

We need not trace here the early stages. It was in 1859, after five years' steady work as an English journalist, that Mr. Maclean went out to India to take up the editorship of the "Bombay Gazette."

> It is difficult (he writes) to imagine a position more forlorn than that of an Indian journalist in those days, when there was no telegraph to Bombay and only a mail from England once a fortnight. Newspaper offices were badly organised and not too well provided with the means of undertaking new enterprises. Indian questions were unfamiliar and distasteful, and an editor too often found himself in the luckless state of being obliged to make bricks without straw. I soon found my employment so intolerable that I threw it up, with the intention of returning to England.

His friends persuaded him, however, to try his fortune once again in India.

> The American Civil War had just begun. The unprecedented demand which then arose for Indian cotton breathed new life into Bombay. Wealth beyond the dreams of avarice poured into the town; splendid buildings sprang up on all sides during the four years the war lasted; there was no speculation which the mercantile community was not ready to undertake; everyone became suddenly a millionaire; and existence followed as fast and furious a course as in California or Melbourne during the height of the gold fever. I was fortunate enough to make some investments which turned out well, and, having first of all started a weekly paper of my own, which won a considerable reputation, I was able in 1864 to put down £15,000 for the purchase of the "Bombay Gazette," of which I remained the proprietor till 1880, when I finally left India. Thus at the age of thirty I had become my own master, with a fair income and a good position.

Mr. Maclean says that he had then learnt to feel himself

at home in Bombay society, and had become " one of the most active members of the community."

I always regard it as one of the most fortunate circumstances of my career that I had the honour to be reckoned among the intimate friends of Sir Bartle Frere, who from 1862 to 1867 held the office of Governor of Bombay. The singular simplicity and modesty of his character made him one of the most lovable of men, and at the same time he was most broad-minded and courageous in the views he took of political affairs, and had shaken himself entirely free from that spirit of monopoly which is the chief defect of the Indian Civil Service. There were no free institutions in Bombay—neither a Parliament nor a municipality; and the Government was a despotism tempered only by the criticism of the newspapers. Sir Bartle Frere recognised the fact that Bombay possessed a considerable body of independent citizens—adventurers they were called in the old days—barristers, solicitors, engineers, professors, merchants, and others, who had nothing to do with the administration of the town whose prosperity they created. He therefore enlarged the Bench of Justices, which had a general supervision of local affairs, adding to it a considerable number of English and Native gentlemen, and the consequence was an immediate outburst of public spirit which led to great changes and inaugurated a system of local self-government in India.

The Justices found fault with the expense and inefficiency of the autocratic government of the city.

After a debate which lasted over two weeks I carried a resolution censuring the Municipal Commissioner, or Prefect of Bombay, and calling upon the Government to grant to the citizens the right to manage their own affairs. As soon as this vote had been carried the Commissioner hurriedly left Bombay, and the Governor sent for me and asked my advice as to what ought to be done. I put forward a plan, which was afterwards adopted, for dividing the town into wards and entrusting the government to an elected municipality. In this municipality, which, with whatever drawbacks, has always done its work well, I subsequently became chairman of the Town Council, and in this capacity I acted as secretary of the Reception Committee when the Prince of Wales visited Bombay, and wrote the address presented to him when he landed and the farewell address he received before leaving India.

Mr. Maclean says " it will be acknowledged by all residents in Western India that I organised in Bombay a public opinion such as existed nowhere else in India, and to which the Government itself was compelled to bow."

This work was greatly facilitated by the existence in Bombay of a large commercial and professional class of non-official Europeans, and by the great variety and the progressive spirit of the Native races inhabiting the town, who showed an independence to which the majority of their countrymen are strangers. On one occasion we succeeded in holding a public meeting of Europeans and Natives, some 5,000 strong, to protest against the action of the Government in levying an income tax from which Indian civil servants were exempted. A petition to Parliament which I had drawn up was unanimously adopted and ordered to be sent to Mr. Fawcett for presentation to the House of Commons, and the obnoxious law was soon afterwards repealed. This is the only instance of which I am aware of public opinion in India overcoming the authority of the Government.

Mr. Maclean goes on to speak of his conversations with Sir Bartle Frere, his studies in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bombay, his researches into the problem of land settlement in India, and his opposition to the warlike policy of Lord Lytton. He was " filled with admiration for the Imperial designs of Lord Beaconsfield " and resolved to fight under that banner when, in the spring of 1880, he came home.

An Indian correspondent writes from Bombay:—The correspondence between Lord George Hamilton and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji is the theme of more than one leading Indian newspaper. It is to be hoped that the India Office will acquaint itself with Native criticism on the subject. I daresay Lord G. Hamilton, who honestly desires to gauge educated Native opinion (not the mutilated excerpts of the official reporter) will learn many things which will make him pause and once more review the policy which her Majesty's Government should pursue with the view of inducing greater satisfaction and contentment in the country. I will quote a few pregnant sentences from three of the leading newspapers. Two are from the " Hindu" and the " Indian Nation," and the third is from an independent Anglo-Indian journal, the " Statesman." The " Hindu " observes:—

As for certain people attempting to widen the differences between Englishman and Indian, it may be said that the noble lord has himself done his best to widen the gulf by bringing all sorts of charges against Indians by even accusing them of disloyalty. If his Lordship will hereafter at least speak in less acrimonious terms of the people of this country and attempt to act in the spirit indicated, the more extreme critics of Government may assume a more friendly tone towards his Lordship personally.

The " Hindu " then comments at length on the so-called " hallucinations " which his Lordship attributes to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and proves that as regards sedition laws, famine, and so forth, it is not Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji who labours under delusions but his Lordship. It concludes:—

The hallucinations are not on the part of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, who writes with unchallengable facts in his possession, but on that of the Secretary of State who has obtained his facts and learned his principles from officials who have no desire to discount the merits of their administration, even by admitting the most obvious facts.

The " Indian Nation " says:—

Helped by his long experience of office, and strong with the strength of the most powerful majority that the House of Commons ever had, he might have been our earthly providence, he might have done immense good to India. But he has chosen to remain cynical, suspicious, scolding, and hostile.

The journal refers to the injustice done to Indians by the arbitrary rules regarding appointments for Indians at Roorkee College, and at Cooper's Hill.

The " Statesman " writes:—

There can be no question that reasoning of the kind employed by Lord George Hamilton in his reply is calculated rather to confirm the educated Native of India in the belief that he is unjustly treated, than to disabuse him of it.

This is the independent judgment of a leading Anglo-Indian journal. It further says regarding the Cooper's Hill controversy:—

Lord George Hamilton makes no attempt in his letter either to lay down the minimum proportion of Europeans or to show that it necessitates the limitation he has decided on. On the contrary he flies off at a tangent to seek a justification to this limitation in a consideration which is absolutely irrelevant and essentially irrational, namely, the fact that the average number of admissions of Natives through Cooper's Hill College, in the absence of any limitation, had hitherto been one a year. That is to say, he practically penalises the educated Native community for an indefinite time to come for no better reason than that in the past they happen to have gained only one of their appointments in a year.

It is to be hoped the Secretary of State may take heart of grace and see himself as others see him, without colour or prejudice. The tinted glasses he has so long worn need to be replaced by a pair of neutral ones. When he has done so it may be an auspicious omen for India. Let us all devoutly hope he will turn over a new page—the page of tolerance, open-mindedness and sympathy.

In the last number of the " Madras Review " there is an interesting article on " Home Education in India," by Mr. A. P. Smith. Mr. Smith is presumably a European. He certainly has an exaggerated view of the superiority of the English over the Indian home. He objects to the veneration with which an Indian son regards his father, and seems to forget that the comradeship now existing between parent and child in England is somteheing quite new, something hardly known when our grandfathers were young. With his main contention, indeed, that education in India can only be complete when it is founded on education in the home, and that this requires a race of educated mothers, we cordially agree. It is a matter for discussion, however, whether female education in India should not be essentially Indian, so that the educational influence of the mother might be a counterpoise to the purely European teaching now given. There is no fear of its being a check. The desire for education is much too strong.

Remittances on India for 30 lakhs were on Wednesday offered for tender by the India Council, and applications for bills to the amount of Rs. 33,30,000 were received at 1s. 3⅞d. and 1s. 3d. and 29-32nds. The following amounts in bills were allotted, viz.:—Rs. 3,00,000 on Calcutta and Rs. 10,000 on Madras, all at an average of 1s. 3.906d. Tenders at 1s. 3d. and 29-32nds will receive in full. Later the Council sold bills for seven lakhs on Calcutta, Rs.10,000 on Bombay, and Rs. 10,000 on Madras, all at 1s. 3d. and 29-32nds. Last week remittances for Rs. 6,66,521 were sold for £44,174, making the total disposed of from April 1 to Tuesday night Rs. 6,59,63,556, producing £4,376,063. Next week the amount to be offered will be reduced to 20 lakhs.

THE PERSISTENT FAMINE.

THE famine, which was supposed to be "over" some six months back, is manifesting a persistence that is most disconcerting. The numbers on relief had counted but 211,000 on February 18, when the Viceroy's telegrams to the Secretary of State were discontinued—a discontinuance that naturally implied to the people at home that they need not trouble themselves any more about the expiring embers of the conflagration. For ourselves, we could not but keep in mind the ominous statement of the Viceroy on February 14 that "greater pressure is expected in the affected area after the reaping of the scanty harvests there." In fact, it turned out that the increase of "pressure" did not wait for the reaping of the scanty harvests: it rose continuously. The reports in the Indian press indicated plainly that the Government was becoming more and more solicitous, although the India Office did nothing to enable the people of this country to know what was really going on or to express their sympathy in a practical form. For example, on March 16, the Government of India authorized the Bombay Government to pass free of customs duty articles imported into India for free distribution to famine-stricken people up to the end of September, and on April 6 it placed at the disposal of the Bombay Government officers for famine duty from Madras and Bengal. Certain movements of the police, too, indicated only too surely the demoralisation of society under the rising strain of insufficiency of food. At length we raised a note of warning (May 10), and suggested that Lord George Hamilton should be afforded an opportunity of explaining to the House and to the country; and Mr. Schwann's question (May 16) drew a statement from Lord George, and a promise of the resumption of publication of the official telegrams. It was then found that the numbers on relief had practically doubled during the three months in which the telegrams had been withheld from the public. Since then, as careful readers will have observed, the condition of the famine-stricken area has gone from bad to worse. The latest telegram (July 6) states that the total number of persons in receipt of relief for the week ended June 29 was 585,000. This gives an increase of no fewer than 54,000 on the week ended June 22—an increase more than double that of the week preceding (25,000).

What hope is there that the numbers on relief will not continue to rise?—that they will not in a few weeks run into seven figures? The Government is apparently helpless, in absolute dependence on shaky hopes of a good rainfall. On June 28, indeed, a good week after the monsoon had burst, the Viceroy was unable to report anything more encouraging than "rainfall light and scattered, and generally insufficient for the purpose of agriculture," and warned us to expect the numbers on relief in Bombay (much the largest contingent of sufferers) "to rise till heavy and good rainfall enables the people to commence cultivation and sowing." So we had to wait for another week, with the certainty of an increase in the numbers in receipt of relief, and the dread uncertainty of "heavy and good rainfall." Then, on July 5, the "Times" correspondent telegraphed from Simla that "the lateness of the monsoon is causing anxiety." For there had been only "fair fall of rain at Surat on the 2nd, and at Rajkot on the 3rd": "with these exceptions"—welcome exceptions indeed, yet trifling in comparison with the rainless expanse—"the whole of the North-west of India, including Gujerat, the north-west dry area, the Central India plateau, the Indo-Gangetic plain, and the west sub-montane divisions, has been practically rainless throughout the week." On July 7, the same correspondent hastened to report what he called an improvement: that rains had fallen in Gujerat, where they were much needed; that currents had also extended over the Central Provinces and Behar, "and it is believed that rain will reach Central India and Rajputana immediately." Further, "the Bay of Bengal current is apparently increasing in strength, promising an extension westwards up the Gangetic plain." The anxiety is sufficiently explained by the feeble morsels of substantial fact conveyed in the latter telegram, on the back of the depressing contents of the former. There is no adjective of measurement to give us any idea of the improvement in the Gujerat rainfall or the Central Provinces current; and then we are treated to "it is believed" and "apparently." And the Viceroy's telegram of July 6, though more elaborate in expression, seems in effect only to emphasise the peril. The only safe inference seems to be that Western India is rapidly plunging into yet another year of unbroken famine—settling down into chronic famine.

Does England realise what this means? Here is the third year of continuous famine over an immense stretch of the Indian Empire—a famine that has been admittedly "the worst of the century" in point of extent and of severity. More than that, it followed, at a startlingly brief interval, another famine that also in its day occupied the bad pre-eminence of "the worst of the century." But there is yet another point that is of supreme importance, however apt to be forgotten; and that is the cumulative effect of such a series of calamitous experiences. On previous occasions we have tried to assist the rather phlegmatic English imagination by presenting glimpses of the frightful state to which the country has been reduced. Only three weeks ago we quoted from the "Christian" newspaper the reports made by Christian workers, English and Indian, in different affected areas, as well as samples of the impressions made upon ordinary secular observers. "Famine," wrote an English lady, "is the one subject of conversation here, and one gets soaked in it"; and active English officials congratulate themselves on having lived through it by reason that "mercifully they got inured to the horror." "Inured to the horror": let comfortable English men and women not thrust the disturbing expression away, but face it honestly in the light of the national responsibility, and reduce their conclusions to practice. The Rev. Dennis Osborne is a well-known and highly-respected missionary, not in the least likely to over-strain the facts; and we must recall what he wrote from Poona on May 17. "I pray," he wrote, "that God's people in Great Britain may send us speedy relief, for we cannot turn away from the suffering around us. What we need is relief for hungry men, women, and children, and support for the numerous orphans." The people cannot help themselves. "Famine," wrote the Rev. P. B. Keskar from the Sholapur district, "has reduced the people to beggary, and they will remain in that condition for a long time, or succumb to its effects, unless help is continued to them until better times appear." These are but specimens: it is no extravagance to suppose that the descriptions apply to many millions—little short of a hundred millions—of our Indian fellow-subjects over the whole famine area. It must be that "God's people in Great Britain"—and in a professedly Christian country there must be many of "God's people"—will be eager to contribute to the "speedy relief" so earnestly prayed for by the good missionary at Poona.

This brings us to the practical means of succour. We should be the last to minimise what Lord George Hamilton has described as the "stupendous and successful efforts which the Government of India has made to mitigate the sufferings" of the afflicted. But it is only too obvious that much still remains to be done after official efforts have been strained to the uttermost. There is a duty that looks to the present, and a duty that looks to the future. We have already expounded with much fulness and earnestness both the one and the other. The duty to the future involves a wide variety of proceedings all converging to the extinction of the causes of famine. Not one of these causes but ought to be sought out persistently and demolished ruthlessly. The question of reafforestation is pressing; the question of irrigation needs to be considered, or rather consideration needs to be acted on; and the enquiries contemplated by the Famine Union urgently demand initiation and completion. There is no reason why all these lines of prevention should not be pressed forward steadily and vigorously. But the immediate duty is still more clamant. On May 31 we wrote this: "We expect daily to hear that the Lord Mayor has re-opened the Mansion House Fund, and presumably one of the first duties of the House of Commons, when it reassembles next week after the Whitsuntide recess, will be to vote a national grant of at least five millions sterling to the aid of the sufferers through famine." Our expectation has hitherto remained unfulfilled. There is no Mansion House Fund to form an outlet for the benevolent sympathy of "God's

people in Great Britain." The House of Commons has neglected what we took to be "one of its first duties." Now, at any rate, it must see that the grip of famine is tightening, and that the land is again in process of desolation. We do not overlook the fact that the Viceroy's most recent telegram announces that the "physical condition of the people is reported to be generally satisfactory in the distressed area." Against that we are contented to set the private reports of men labouring incessantly among the people, and to ask our legislators to try to imagine what their own physical condition would probably be in like circumstances. Besides, this is far beyond a personal and physical matter. It is a political question. At the same time, quite apart from the political possibilities, have we not—do we not recognise—a moral duty? It is vain to urge that some of the leaders of Indian opinion repudiate a grant. These same leaders in the same breath declare that what they want is justice. But nobody can regard the admission of an overcharge of a quarter of a million a year as anything like a satisfaction of the justice of the case. The duty is plain and clamant, and we still trust that the House of Commons will manfully recognise it, and bring immediate aid to the sorely tried sufferers.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

Westminster, Thursday.

A truce rather than a peace has been proclaimed by the warring sections of the Liberal party, and yet, in the Elizabethan phrase, it is not a truce either. There are to be no more cabals, no more sectional organisations, no more personal jealousies, and—here is the rub—no more pretences at unity. Every man, in future, may do what is right in his own eyes, and none shall be at liberty to cast a stone at him. A meeting called to restore discipline has decided, in effect, that the reins of discipline must be relaxed. The Liberal party is to be a confederation rather than a distinct entity. Its one bond of union is to be the leadership of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, but even that is accepted strictly without prejudice to the independence of Sir Henry's supporters. The whole thing sounds very paradoxical, and perhaps the strangest paradox of all is that so queer a solution of a problem that is really insoluble should have given general satisfaction.

But when all is said and done, last Tuesday's conference must be credited with a substantial service to the cause of Liberalism. The principle of compromise, always dear to Englishmen, pervaded the speeches, and prevailed in the final settlement. Tested by the rules of logic, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman's position would appear to be more untenable than ever. As a matter of fact, the leader of the Opposition sits more securely in his place, in consequence of recent events, than any Liberal leader has done since the retirement of Mr. Gladstone. He has been tried in the balance and not found wanting. Had he wavered at any time within the last fortnight he would have lost the game, both for himself and for the Liberal party. Happily, Sir Henry proved himself not only a man of spirit, but a consummate tactician. He had won the fight days before the meeting was held, and it was in the mood of conciliation which he desires to encourage in greater affairs that the victor contented himself in the end with the fruits of victory without making a fussy claim to the laurels. Prophecy is rarely safe in politics, otherwise one might venture to predict that despite its claims to independence of thought and action, the Opposition of the future would be a much more harmonious body than that of the past.

Meanwhile, the Asquith dinner, out of which all the trouble was supposed to have sprung, goes forward, and those who had hoped for a Liberal schism are extracting a meagre consolation from the fact. This little festivity, however, is no longer invested with any sinister significance. It will be made the occasion of a reassertion of Mr. Asquith's loyalty to his leader and his political faith, and for a vigorous exposure of the shortcomings of the feeblest Government of modern times. One other point should be noted. Sir William Harcourt and Mr. John Morley were present at Tuesday's conference, and voted for the resolution of confidence in Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman. Accordingly, they are now to be numbered as formal adherents of the new dispensation. It was the first occasion on which they had shared in the counsels of the party since their valedictory correspondence at the beginning of 1899.

Perhaps the most noteworthy feature of the second reading debate on the Education Bill was the unmasking of Sir John Gorst. This was quite a voluntary performance. Sir John has always posed as a friend of education, a democrat, and a cynic; and paradoxical as it may seem, his cynicism has generally been accepted as a guarantee of the genuineness of his other qualities. On his own showing it is the only one of them that remains. "Are we in this House," he asked the other night, "to keep up the farce of pretending to believe that School Boards are elected for educational purposes? Everybody knows that that is the very last idea that governs their election. They are elected on religious grounds or on party grounds, but I never yet heard of a single candidate who was elected on educational grounds." Truly an inspiring creed for a Minister of Education!

One of the most useful of the continuation classes of the London School Board is that in which police constables are "coached" for examinations to test their fitness for promotion. Sir John Gorst's allusion to this excellent institution was characteristic. "In this class," he observed with a sneer, "we have teachers instructing police constables how to answer questions relating to the life and duty of the policeman." A class to instruct Sir John Gorst in the duties of a Minister of Education ought to be added to the curriculum. Most of his own followers, although they spoke and voted for his Bill, warmly resented the tone of his speech, one excellent effect of which has been to rouse the antagonism of the School Boards throughout the country.

A lively debate on transubstantiation, which occupied the House of Lords for two hours the other evening, was brought to an end at last, just in time for dinner, by the opportune discovery that the discussion was out of order. The King's declaration in the amended form, suggested by the Select Committee appointed to deal with the subject, might be subscribed to by the Pope himself. "Nay," says Earl Grey, "it might be made by any infidel from the Mahdi to the Empress of China." Lord Salisbury, who is never happier than when he is flouting the Archbishop of Canterbury, sneered at the idea that the Committee might have produced a more satisfactory alternative if it had been strengthened by an "infusion of Bishops," while Lord Rosebery, on the ground that the subject was too full of mystery for an open Parliamentary debate, took the opposite line, and urged that the Committee should be asked to re-consider the whole question. Happily, the matter is one of no great urgency. The Government intend to embody their proposals in a Bill, which will certainly not become law this Session.

Mr. Edgar Wallace, a war correspondent whose head is full of Boer atrocities, and whose conscience appears to have been absolutely revolted by the leniency of the British Commander-in-Chief, has been daring enough to arraign Lord Kitchener, the press censors in South Africa, and Ministers at home for suppressing the truth about the murderous tactics of the enemy. As the authorities mutilate his telegrams he has impeached them in a long letter to his editor, and has reiterated certain statements which Lord Kitchener had already stigmatised as totally unfounded. The dispute is one of considerable public importance, and the War Office are instituting a fresh enquiry into the facts. Severe punishment, according to Lord Stanley, awaits Mr. Wallace unless he is able to substantiate his allegations.

Madame Sarah Bernhardt has added to her other triumphs a conquest of the city and the Mansion House. The indefatigable tragedienne was cheered by the representatives of commerce last Monday when she stepped from her brougham into the sphere of civic hospitality. Her reception by the Lord Mayor was regal, and later, when the great lady favoured a charity concert with her presence, the applause of the audience was tumultuous. Subsequently the divine Sarah made a call at Stafford House to make some purchases at a bazaar on behalf of the Scotch crofters. Those little amenities, we are told, are doing more than can easily be imagined to stimulate an entente cordiale between France and England. The

Paris papers publish ecstatic accounts of the famous actress's social victories, and with each addition to the list they discover a new virtue in the British temperament.

INDIAN FAMINES: THEIR CAUSES AND PREVENTION.—I.

By C. W. Whish.
(Late of the Indian Civil Service.)

The recent lecture by Mr. J. D. Rees on this subject was in some respects the most interesting which has been read of late before the East India Association. It was temperate, thoughtful, and sympathetic, and scarcely obnoxious to the charge of official optimism which was levied against it by one speaker. Official optimism seems to imply blindness to real facts, and want of sympathy with the people of India. This accusation could scarcely be justly brought against the lecturer, who evidently feels deeply the pathos of Indian peasant life, and yearns to ameliorate the condition of the dumb and patient millions of our Eastern Dependency. Nor would the possible criticism that nothing remains to be said on such a well-worn subject be a just one. On the contrary the proceedings seemed to show, not only that there is still a great deal to be said on the subject, but that a numerous set of subsidiary and kindred topics are intimately linked with it, all of which require the fullest deliberation and discussion separately, before any satisfactory conclusion can be come to on the principal question. It might, perhaps, be the subject of complaint that the discussion only played about the real question at issue (the most important of which seems to be whether all that lies in human power to prevent famines has or has not been done) so to speak, but never boldly faced them. Still more justly might it be urged that the discussion was too hurried to be of any real use. This seems to be the case more or less in all the meetings of the Association, and is perhaps one reason why they are so thinly attended. If the sittings could be in the evening, or if they could be made attractive by tea and light refreshments, or if this is impracticable, then if adjournment were made the rule instead of the exception, the usefulness of the Association would surely be largely increased. A kind of conversazione would be most appropriate to the meeting of various individuals interested in India: they could be brought into closer contact, compare opinions, and feel the magic of co-operation. At this particular meeting one speaker said that the lecture presented no particular field for criticism or discussion. This seems a most extraordinary statement: at least half a dozen most important subjects are, as above stated, intimately bound up with this one. On all of these subjects it is most important that the people of England should have clear ideas, and a large number of the gentlemen present (many of them retired officers of the Indian Government) ought to have had a great deal to tell them about most of them.

In the first place the whole subject of the middleman between the Government of India as supreme landlord, and the actual tiller of the soil, was opened up, and we might have talked profitably on the subject alone for the whole afternoon. I may remark in passing how easily the middleman may be got rid of, if as was remarked by one speaker he is really an evil. You have only to sell him up, and take the estate under direct management whenever he is insolvent, and during seasons of calamity nearly everyone is insolvent. There is sometimes too much tenderness as well as too much harshness about our Revenue system, and in our regard for the individual we occasionally overlook the interests of the estate.

Then there are the questions of the employment of Native talent in the Administration, indigenous industries, and technical training, and the subsidiary ones to which these naturally lead. Most important of all are the questions of method of assessment and the Revenue system in general, including, of course, that of the middleman, as mentioned above. Even after concluding the list we have not even mentioned the questions of litigation or contribution by the State or private individuals to Famine Relief.

On these, perhaps, the dividing line of opinion is not so strongly marked. But on the other question the cleavage is very great, and it is most important to get as full and patient deliberation and discussion as possible. All these subjects want to be thoroughly sifted and threshed out, and I make no apology for offering a few observations of my own, which I might have made at Westminster Town Hall had time been less restricted.

I begin with the subject I took last in order, viz., that of assessment and the land revenue system. Some well-wishers of India are perhaps a little too fond of assuming that all her evils are due to the rapacity of her rulers. It does not always follow that a light assessment is directly conducive to the welfare of the agricultural community. If it is so light as to give no stimulus to exertion, it may really be a curse in the guise of a blessing. In India we are nearly always on the horns of a dilemma. If we were too yielding to the agricultural community in the matter of assessment, we might collect nothing, or next to nothing, and have to replace the income we had surrendered by all sorts of imposts of a more objectionable kind. On the other hand the very agriculturist who had attempted to escape from his legitimate burden might sit down resignedly to bear burdens which were really too heavy for him, until he was crushed and ruined in the process. It, therefore, behoves us to be always on the look out to see that our assessments are not too high. Although we sometimes actually dare not even talk of reduction of assessment because we should certainly have land designedly thrown out of cultivation if we did not have an agrarian riot, still this difficult and delicate work has to be done. To begin with we must be sure that we do not underestimate the expenses of the revenue-payer. If we only took one half of the net, or one sixth of the gross produce, nobody could complain. But I fear we do the revenue-payer a wrong by not making allowances for the numerous petty and irregular payments, some of them uncomfortably like blackmail, which he has to pay. We are far too fond of ignoring these things, when their lamentable reality causes our systems to break down simply because they are ignored.

We have such a full and elaborate system of agricultural statistics nowadays that it ought to be rarely difficult to ascertain what the half-asset assessment ought to be. Then we ought to err on the side of leniency, for the present at all events, because of the blackmail. Wait a few years and we may hope to eliminate or largely reduce it, but it is useless and fatal to ignore blackmail now. Our local officers ought always to be watching the estates under their charge to see that they are not overburdened, and that they are in the right hands. In any case of great uncertainty the Revenue Administration ought to be ready to step in, manage the estate directly, and find out what the half-asset assessment ought to be. Our Native subordinates often do us a grievous injustice by fancying that we are so greedy for money that we will not even entertain the idea of reduction of assessment. They forget that it is the fault of the Native character that we have to be so unyielding in our demands. They, therefore, rarely report the impoverished condition of an estate. And the European officer has rarely either the time or the ability to find out for himself.

But, of course, a portion of the responsibility rests with us. I think if we laid stress on three points we should find matters change considerably for the better. Let us get it thoroughly into the heads of our Native subordinates first that we take a just and truthful view of our landlords' liabilities as well as of their assets; secondly, that we are prepared to give remissions where assessments are manifestly too high; thirdly, that we are determined that every estate shall be given the best chance of development possible, by changing the proprietorship if unsatisfactory.

A few explanatory words are necessary on each of these points. First as to the blackmail: the proprietor is often charged with levying this upon his tenantry, and no doubt he will always do so if powerful enough. But do not let us fail to take into consideration the other side of the question: the "raison d'etre" of the impost is nearly always the enforced payment of something "not quite in the bond" by the landlord himself. What this "something" is will be readily understood by anyone who knows Asia, and it is difficult to explain to those who do not. It amounts in plain language to this, that everyone who has more power and less pay than is good for him (and in Asia nearly every official is in this position) demands a contribution from the landlord. As above stated let us keep these things steadily before our eyes instead of ignoring them, and always try and give the proprietor "a margin" not only for irregular demands but also for calamities of season. Next as to revision of demand during the currency of even a temporary settlement. It cannot be too often reiterated that difficult and even dangerous as this work is, it still has to be done. And we cannot recoup ourselves by the converse process of enhancing a revenue which has been fixed too low. The fear of this, even at the end of the period of settlement, constantly prevents the resources of the land being developed to the full. If all our sources of information fail, and it is still uncertain whether an estate is fairly assessed or not, we can always solve the problem by direct management. Constant firm pressure on the Native subordinate staff is necessary to impress upon them that the interests of the agriculturist are identical with those of the Government they serve, and that any estate which remains too heavily burdened is a double injury, both to their masters and to the people, which will eventually lead to their being punished for neglect of duty by not reporting it. And this leads us naturally to the third point. It is not always over-assessment which is the cause of an estate being in difficulties. It may be in the wrong hands—in the possession of proprietors who are so hopelessly involved, or so thriftless that they cannot do their duty by it. It will then be the best thing for all parties for the estate to change hands as speedily as possible. Do not let us bolster up a proprietor who cannot develop the land to the utmost. Such ultra-benevolence is as foolish as over-severity, and has equally to be guarded against.

(To be concluded.)

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

Thursday, July 4.—In the House of Commons Mr. Chamberlain was asked whether, in view of the great interest which the colonies took in Imperial affairs, he would consider the desirability of representing to the King the advantage of extending his Majesty's title so that it might express clearly his sovereignty over the whole Empire; and he replied that he had been in communication with the colonies on this subject, and that he hoped a Bill dealing with it would shortly be introduced.

In the discussion on the second reading of the Bill authorizing the loan of sixty millions for the war, there was a sharp passage between Mr. Balfour and Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman. Mr. Balfour said that the Leader of the Opposition had at last come off the fence, and had made a frankly "pro-Boer" speech. Sir Henry suitably chastised him for the offensive and question-begging epithet.

A Parliamentary vacancy having occurred through the resignation of Captain Oliver Young, the Unionist party in the Wokingham Division of Berkshire selected Mr. Ernest Gardner to be their candidate at the election.

The London School Board passed a resolution by 28 votes to 16 protesting against any temporary Education Bill which should not allow the Board to carry on for the time being its evening continuation schools, etc., without the intervention of any other local authority. The resolution was opposed by the Moderate party as a whole, but was supported by Sir Charles Elliott.

The House of Lords granted an application for the postponement of Earl Russell's trial for bigamy. It was originally fixed for July 18, but, in order to allow Earl Russell time to procure American evidence, stated to be essential to his defence, their lordships agreed to its being postponed until August 6.

FRIDAY, July 5.—In the House of Lords the Lord Chancellor, replying to a question from Lord Galway, said their lordships might have observed that the House agreed, on the production of certain affidavits, to the adjournment of the trial of Lord Russell till August 6. The Clerk of Parliaments had since received a letter from the solicitor representing the noble lord stating that in his view the time fixed was too short, and he therefore declined to produce any affidavits. Therefore the trial stood, as originally fixed, for the 18th of the present month.

Lord Kitchener reported the capture by Colonel Grenfell of 93 Boers and 56 wagons, with a number of rifles and rounds of ammunition. In a later telegram he gave news of a train-wrecking incident in which an officer and eleven soldiers and seven other persons lost their lives.

It was announced that Mr. Justice Stanley, of the High Court of Calcutta, had been appointed Chief Justice at Allahabad, and Mr. Harry L. Stephen had been appointed a Judge of the High Court of Calcutta in his stead. Sir V. Bhashyam Iyengar was appointed a judge of the High Court of Madras in place of Mr. Justice Shepherd, who was retiring.

SATURDAY, July 6.—Mr. Chamberlain, presiding at the first congregation of Birmingham University, sketched what, in his opinion, were the functions of an ideal University, suggesting that it should be a place where everything that was known should be taught, and where knowledge should be tested, increased by original research, and applied. He expressed his conviction that England had fallen behind her competitors in the matter of higher education, and pointed out the great opportunities which lay open to rich men in this connexion, concluding with a declaration of his firm assurance that we were ready to face sacrifices in order to make up for lost time.

The University match at Lords ended according to expectation in a draw. Cambridge declared their second innings closed when they had made 337 for eight wickets, leaving Oxford with 327 to get to win. They began so badly that it looked as if they might be severely beaten. Marsham, however, played a fine innings (100 not out), and the later batsmen did a little better. When stumps were drawn at seven o'clock they had only made 177, but they still had three wickets to fall.

The Duke and Duchess of Cornwall sailed for Adelaide from Hobart, Tasmania. His Royal Highness had in the afternoon laid the foundation-stone of the new Hobart Post Office.

Prince Hohenlohe, who was Imperial Chancellor of Germany from 1894, when Count von Caprivi resigned, until last year, when he was succeeded by Count von Bulow, died at Ragaz.

MONDAY, July 8.—In the House of Commons Lord Stanley informed Mr. MacNeill that there were about 251,000 troops in South Africa, of whom 14,000 were on the sick list. Replying to Sir E. Vincent, he stated that the total number of Boers killed, wounded, and taken prisoners in March was 1,472, in April 2,434, in May 2,640, and in June 1,538.

Sir John Gorst moved the second reading of the Education (No. 2) Bill. The debate was adjourned.

The Duke and Duchess of Cornwall arrived at Adelaide.

It was stated that the total subscriptions to the All India Victoria Memorial Fund for the building of a hall in Calcutta amounted up to the middle of last month to over £234,000. It had been officially announced at Simla that the King had been pleased to offer to the Viceroy a series of paintings for the proposed hall. They were executed by command of her late Majesty, and illustrate important events in her life and reign. "This handsome gift," said the official communique, "is an indication of the keen personal interest which is taken by his Majesty in the Indian Memorial, the fullest information about which has been communicated to him."

TUESDAY, July 9.—A general meeting of the Liberal members of the House of Commons was held at the Reform Club. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, who presided, said recent events had disclosed a serious discord in the party which hindered united action, and as it was his duty as well as his chief desire to maintain harmony, without which the party could not do what it ought to do, it had become necessary for him to ascertain whether he still retained that confidence which was indispensable to any effort he might make. He had no personal complaint to make, and he was profoundly grateful for the kindness which had been shown to him. They were numerically a weak party, but they had a great function to discharge, and they could discharge it if they would apply to it the energy and ingenuity which he saw were very often dissipated upon the exposure of their own differences from each other. Even in regard to the war their differences had been greatly exaggerated. The subject of the first importance at present was, not the origin of the war nor the way it had been conducted in the past, but the present administration of affairs, and above all the future policy to be adopted in South Africa. He asked if he did not express the opinion of four-fifths of the party when he said that every effort should be made to bring the war to a speedy and victorious conclusion, but that while we held the sword in one hand we should hold out the olive branch in the other. It was said that the Boers would listen to nothing but impossible terms, but he still maintained that it would be wise to make known our generous and kindly intentions regarding the future. We should avoid unnecessary harshness in our military operations, and we should announce a generous amnesty for all British subjects who had taken up arms against us. Lastly, we should promise that as soon as ordinary social conditions were re-established the free, independent system of colonial self-government should be set up, leading ultimately, if the several States so desired, to a Federal Constitution in South Africa. Why were the Liberals not united? He believed it was through the operation of certain personal antagonisms which exaggerated differences of opinion. He was no partisan of any side in these antagonisms, which were confined to a few individuals who did not know the mischief they did. They would never restore efficiency to the party unless cabals were put down, and he appealed to those present to lend their aid in extinguishing the cabals.—Sir J. Kitson moved a resolution expressing the most cordial appreciation of the services rendered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman to the party and to Liberal principles in Parliament and in the country, and also hearty and continued confidence in him as leader. Sir Joseph Pease seconded the motion, and it was supported by Dr. Farquharson, Mr. C. Fenwick, Mr. A. Thomas, Sir William Harcourt, Sir Edward Grey, and Mr. Asquith. Mr. Asquith said reference had been made to cabals and intrigues. If they existed it was without his consent, or even his knowledge. Nothing in the whole of his political life had pained him more than that he should be supposed to be capable of lending himself to an intrigue to oust Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman from the leadership of the party. He did not believe that the bulk of their differences could be put down to personal causes. The vote of confidence was carried unanimously.

In the House of Commons the Liberal amendment to the motion for the second reading of the "Education" Bill was defeated by 118 votes (333-215) and the Bill was read a second time.

WEDNESDAY, July 10.—Commenting on the meeting of the Liberal party, the "Manchester Guardian" wrote:—"There is no longer any reason for suppression. The word has gone forth that it is lawful to differ. There is, on the contrary, every reason for effort for the party, and every man in it is on trial. Liberty is of no avail if we do not use it, and the only excuse for differing when we are bound to differ will be united and strenuous action up to the very limits where agreement ceases to be possible. On these terms we may have a more efficient even if at times an apparently less united Opposition, and the political life of the country is bound to gain by a new-found sincerity. What may happen in the inner councils of the party, in that mysterious region where resolutions are drafted and the Parliamentary policy of the party is supposed to be laid down, we forbear to enquire. Within this circle there will, we imagine, be less room in the future for the exercise of ingenuity in compromise and more for honesty in dissent. Where agreement is impracticable the leader must take his own line and take it strongly. For the rest, all who have convictions must bestir themselves with redoubled vigour to enforce them. Out of such efforts alone can arise the new life which shall animate the party and the policy which shall prevail."

Speaking at a "Liberal Unionist" dinner, Mr. Chamberlain, whose ideas of Cabinet etiquette are notoriously peculiar, said:—I remember very well that fifteen years ago I had an important interview with Mr. Gladstone, all the details of which are fresh in my mind. He had sent for me to speak to me about the land legislation which he contemplated in Ireland. It was while I was still a member of what was subsequently known as the Home Rule Government, and when our discussion upon the immediate subject was over I ventured to say to him, "Mr. Gladstone, I suppose you are now conducting that enquiry into the demands of the Irish members which you have undertaken to make. I do not know at what conclusion you will arrive, but I think it my duty to tell you what is my honest and sincere conviction if you should decide to introduce a measure to establish a separate Parliament in Ireland. You will be beaten in the House of Commons and you will be beaten in the country." Mr. Gladstone said to me, with all that emphasis which we remember when he was interested in the subject, "I shall never go to the country upon this subject. I do not know at what conclusion—I have not made up my mind—I ought to arrive. But if it should be the one you indicate, I will put my views and propositions before the House of Commons and accept their decision. But I would never appeal to the country on such a matter. I would not take that responsibility, knowing it would break up the Liberal party, that it would dissolve old friendships and be a calamity." Six weeks afterwards he dissolved Parliament upon that question.

THURSDAY, July 11.—With reference to Mr. Chamberlain's anecdote last night, it is pointed out that the dates don't fit. He said the conversation took place six weeks before the dissolution. The announcement of the dissolution was made on June 10. Therefore Mr. Chamberlain's conversation must have been at the end of April. But the Home Rule Bill had been introduced on April 8, and the Land Bill on April 16. Mr. Chamberlain had resigned office on March 27. Clearly, then, the conversation could not have taken place "six weeks" before the dissolution. Mr. Chamberlain appears to have a bad memory for dates. But what a memory for ipsissima verba!

LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

"INDIA IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY."

To the Editor of "India."

Sir,—Mr. Demetrius C. Boulger's letter in your issue of yesterday demands a rejoinder from me. This rejoinder shall be brief and (unless something specially calls for answer) this shall be my last word in your columns on this subject.

1. Wheat.—As I imagined was the case, Mr. Boulger referred to "export," but he wrote "cultivation."

2. Cotton.—Again he meant "export"; he wrote that cultivation "was introduced during the American civil war"—meaning that "export then rose by leaps and bounds" (Hunter). What Sir W. W. Hunter wrote was correct, but it has nothing to do with what Mr. Boulger stated.

3. Area under Cultivation.—Exactly following the Famine Commission of 1880 (Part I., page 50), I put the "cultivation" in 1880, which was what Mr. Boulger refers to, at 182,750,000 acres, made up thus:—

	Acres.
Food-crop area	161,250,000
Non-food crop area	21,500,000
Total	182,750,000

This total, he says, should be 142,100,480 acres because "current fallows" were not then reckoned, and because there are 41,200,834 acres of "current fallows" in 1898-99—nineteen years later. However, he spoke of "cultivation" not fallow-land, and he declared "cultivation had doubled in forty years." Fortunately the details are available with which to show where Mr. Boulger's most serious error lies. "Current fallows" do not come in the 1880-81 figures which I gave. Area under crops only was dealt with. I will take the "Material and Moral Progress" figures for 1882-83 (page 16) which Mr. Boulger cites. They prove my case, prove it beyond peradventure. Omit, as the Famine Commission of 1880 did in making their estimate, Burma 3,746,279 acres and add, for Bengal (which they included), 48,000,000 for food-crops. I add—where they put a query—6,000,000 for non-food-crops, say 54,000,000 acres in all; then how do the Famine Commission figures stand? They show this result:—

	Acres.
The Famine Commission cultivation figures for 1880, as I put them, not counting fallows	182,750,000
The "Moral and Material" figures for 1882-83 (again not counting fallows), 134,257,852, minus Burma, as Burma was not included in 1880, 3,746,279 equals 130,511,573, but, plus Bengal, which was included, 54,000,000 ...	184,511,573
Increase	1,761,573

Actually those are the true figures, and it is Mr. Boulger who is 50,000,000 acres out in his statement; two millions of acres excess in 1882-83 over 1880 fairly represent increased cultivation in all India, less Burma, after two "good" years. There is no question in either of the cases I mentioned of current fallows; they are outside the calculations all the time.

Before dealing with the figures, I submit that Mr. Boulger should have remembered that he wishes to be regarded as an expert on India of twenty-five years' standing. No expert should have done as he has done. He has left out of his calculation for 1880-81 all particulars concerning the Lower Provinces of Bengal, Lower and Upper Burma, and Ajmere-Merwara, which were only introduced into the tables in 1886-87, 1887-88, and 1890-91, respectively. In the totals for 1898-99 the various countries figure as follows:—

	Acres.
"Total area under crops" in Bengal in 1898-99	65,708,800
Fallow land in 1898-99 (increase since 1884-85, first year of inclusion) ...	22,174,186
Add Lower and Upper Burma 1898-99, neither included in 1880	10,085,342
Acres	97,968,328

Mr. Boulger claims an increased cultivation of 95,787,897 acres over 1880-81 as the result of low taxation; the Director-General of Statistics accounts for 97,968,328, apart altogether from taxation, low or high, by including all the above in his returns, and states in footnotes in his largest compilation when the respective countries were included.

All my remarks on salt—its alleged cheapening under British rule and the alleged marvellous increased consumption, are (wisely) left untouched in Mr. Boulger's reply.

The reader will note that, as an individual, I do not at all come into this controversy: the dispute is not between any assertions of mine and this author's mis-statements, but between the official facts, as recorded by the Director-General of Statistics, and Mr. Boulger's misrepresentation of those official details.

Mr. Boulger considers that to write "cultivation" when "cultivation" is meant, and "introduction" when "introduction" is meant—and not when, in each case, "export" is meant, and to be accurate in dealing with statistics, is "fanaticism" on my part. It is a pity that such "fanaticism" is not a part of his own literary equipment.—Yours, etc.,

Wm. DIGBY.

Bromley, Kent.
July 6, 1901.

BRITISH DEMOCRACY AND INDIA.

ADDRESS BY MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

(From Our Own Reporter.)

A meeting was held at the North Lambeth Liberal Club on Thursday evening, July 4, at which Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji delivered an address on "British Democracy and India." The chair was taken at nine o'clock by Colonel Ford.

The Chairman, in opening the proceedings, said there were many parts of the world in which England was deeply interested, but no part deserved greater interest than India. The question before the meeting was one of vast importance, as he believed would be fully shown by Mr. Naoroji. The position of India demanded the closest attention of all Englishmen, as they were responsible for that position. There were very many highly educated and intelligent Indians quite able to take a share in the government of their own country, and yet they were precluded from doing so, the administration being almost entirely in the hands of Englishmen, so far as the higher posts were concerned.

Mr. Naoroji, who was cordially received, said:—Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I feel very great pleasure in being permitted to address you to-night. I propose at the outset to explain to you what the condition of India is in order that you may the better understand the relations which exist between that country and England. In the first place, I will tell you what has been repeatedly laid down as the policy to be pursued towards India. In 1833 this policy was definitely decided and embodied in an Act of Parliament, and it was a policy of justice and righteousness. It provided that no Native of India, nor any natural-born subject of his Majesty resident therein, should by reason only of his religion, place of birth, descent, or any of them, be disabled from holding any place, office, or employment under the Company. That is to say, that all British subjects in India should be treated alike, and merit alone should be the qualification for employment. The Indian people asked nothing more than the fulfilment of this policy, but from that day to this no such policy has been pursued towards India. A similar declaration of policy was made in the most solemn manner after the Mutiny. The Queen's Proclamation addressed to India at that time in 1858, stated as follows:—"We hold ourselves bound to the Natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our other subjects, and those obligations, by the blessing of Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil. . . . . And it is our further will that, so far as may be, our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified, by their education, ability, and integrity, duty to discharge. . . . . When, by the blessing of Providence, internal tranquillity shall be restored, it is our earnest desire to stimulate the peaceful industry of India, to promote works of public utility and improvement, and to administer the government for the benefit of all our subjects resident therein. In their prosperity will be our strength, in their contentment our security, and in their gratitude our best reward. And may the God of all power grant to us and to those in authority under us strength to carry out these our wishes for the good of our people." Such was the solemn pledge that was made to India. But where is the fulfilment? The same distinction of race and creed exists in India now as ever existed. That pledge so solemnly made half a century ago has never been carried out. One would have thought that their sense of honour would have prompted the Executive to fulfil this pledge, but such has not been the case. These pledges and declarations of policy have been to us dead letters. (Shame.) This then is the first thing you have to know. What has been the result of the system of government administered in India? The result has been to bring the country to a state of poverty and misery unknown elsewhere throughout the world. This result has been accomplished by the constant draining of India's wealth, for let it be known that we have to produce every year something like twenty million pounds by our labour and our produce and hand this over to the English before we can utilise a single farthing's worth ourselves. This draining has been going on for years and years with ever-increasing severity. We are made to pay all the expenditure in connexion with the India Office, and every farthing that is required to keep up the Indian Army, even though this latter is supported for England's own use in order to maintain her position in the East and elsewhere. If you want to maintain your position in the East, by all means do so, but do it at your own expense. (Hear, hear.) Why should India be charged for it? Even if you pay half of the cost of your Indian Army we shall be satisfied and pay the other half ourselves. Every farthing of the cost of the wars by which your British-Indian Empire was formed has been paid by us, and not only was this the case, but that Empire, be it remembered, was secured to you by Indian blood. It was Indian soldiers who shed their blood in the formation of the Indian Empire, and the reward that we get is that we are treated as the helots of the British people. India is the richest country in the world in mineral and other wealth, but owing to the constant drain you have put upon our resources, you have brought our people to a state of exhaustion and poverty. At the beginning of last century the drain on Indian produce amounted to about five million pounds per annum; now it has increased to something like thirty million pounds. Each year thirty millions sterling are exacted from India without any return in any material shape. (Shame.) Of this tremendous sum, however, part goes back to India, but not, mark you, for the benefit of the Indian people. It goes back under the name of British

capital, and is used by British capitalists to extract from the Indian soil its wealth of minerals, which wealth goes to enrich the English alone. And thus India is bled, and has been bled ever since the middle of the eighteenth century. India produces food enough for all her needs and to spare. How is it then that so many of her people die for want of it? The reason is simple. So exhausted are the people, and so heavily has the continued bleeding told upon their resources that they are too poor to purchase food, and, therefore, there is chronic famine in good years and in bad years. Do not think that famines only occur when you in England hear of them. You only hear of the very severest of them. One hundred and fifty millions of your fellow-subjects do not know what it is to have one full meal a day. What would be the position of England if she were left to feed on her own resources? She does not produce a quarter of the food required to feed her people. It is only because England is a rich country, thanks largely to India, and can, therefore, buy the produce of other countries that her people are kept from starving. Compare this with the condition of India. She produces more than she requires, and yet through their poverty her people are unable to buy food, and famine is the consequence as soon as a drought occurs. And now we come to the main point of my lecture. On whose shoulders does the responsibility for the present miserable condition of things in India rest? It rests on the shoulders of the British democracy, and I will tell you how. One elector in England has more voice in the Government of his country than the whole of the Indian people have in the government of their country. In the Supreme Legislative Council in India there are only four or five Indians, and what power can so few have in that assembly? The Government appoint their own Executive Council, and it takes care that the few Indian members of the Legislative Council have no real voice in the management of their own country. A Tax Bill comes before the Council, and these Indian members have not the slightest power to vote, make a motion, or suggest an amendment. If they do not vote for it the Government turn round and say "look at these Indians; do they think the Government can be carried on without taxation? they are not fit to govern." The fact is the Tax Bill is brought into the Council only to receive its formal sanction. No chance is given for discussion or amendment. These few Indians have to join with the other members of the Council in taxing their countrymen, without any voice in the expenditure of that taxation. Their power in fact is nil. Economically and politically India is in the worst possible position. The British public are responsible for the burdens under which India is groaning. The democracy is in power in this country, and it should understand something of our suffering, because it has suffered itself. We appeal to you to exercise your power in making your Government carry out its solemn pledges. If you succeeded in doing this, the result would be that the Empire would be strengthened and benefit would be experienced by yourselves as well as by India. India does not want to sever her connexion with England, but rather to strengthen that connexion. I wish to point out that unless the British democracy exercise their power in bringing to India a better state of things, the whole responsibility for our suffering will lie at their door. I therefore appeal to you to do your duty and relieve us from the deplorable miseries from which we are suffering. (Cheers.)

A discussion followed, and the proceedings concluded with a vote of thanks to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

585,000 ON RELIEF.

RAIN URGENTLY NEEDED.

THE PUNJAB "PRACTICALLY RAINLESS."

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Viceroy, dated July 6:—

Famine.—Rainfall fairly heavy and general and unsteady on both coasts; but in Bombay, Deccan, Central Provinces, Eastern Bengal, Burma, Assam, rainfall has been generally sufficient for agricultural purposes. In Gujerat rainfall up to date less than one inch, and more rain is urgently needed. Fall light and irregular in Western Bengal, Orissa, and Chota Nagpur. In North-West Provinces light scattered showers only. Punjab practically rainless. Prices do not indicate much present anxiety. Prices stationary in Punjab, North-West Provinces, Central Provinces; fluctuating in both directions in Bengal; rising in Madras, where, however, on the whole, prospects are fair. In Bombay they are still 100 per cent. below last year pitch in Gujerat and Khandesh, and are now here less than 25 per cent. below. Highest prices are Poona 10, Ahmednagar 11 seers per rupee. Bombay death-rate below normal, being less than two per thousand in six districts, and rising to four per thousand in Dharwar only. Physical condition of the people reported to be generally satisfactory in distressed area, except two taluks, Ahmednagar. Number on relief works and gratuitous relief in Bombay has risen considerably. Number of persons in receipt of relief for the week ending 25th June last:—Bombay, 472,000; Bombay Native States, 53,000; Baroda, 31,000; Haidarabad, 16,000; Madras, 4,000; Central Indian States, 7,000; Central Provinces, 2,000. Total, 585,000.

A telegram from the Governor of Bombay, dated the 8th inst., states that good rain has fallen in Gujerat.

The "Investors' Review" writes (July 6):—Inconveniently belated, the Viceroy's end of June famine telegram did not appear until Saturday last week, and consequently found no place in our columns. It is dated June 28, and we append it here as it stands because of the hint given in it that, as we have from the first said, distress was bound to expand and become more severe as time went on. His description of the shortage of rainfall in the interior to those who have in the slightest degree followed the course of Indian seasons is charged with gloomy significance. On the eight days that had elapsed since Lord Curzon sent his previous message the increase in the numbers striving to keep body and soul together on our relief works has been 25,000. Is it the feeding of the Boer prisoners that has sent prices up so far at Ahmednagar?

THE INDIAN FAMINE UNION.

WITHDRAWAL OF MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

We have received the following letter for publication. A reference to the matter will be found in our editorial columns.

Washington House, 72, Anerley Park,
London, S.E., July 6, 1901.

Dear Sir William,—I find that my position in "The Indian Famine Union" is misunderstood in some quarters. As a general rule I avoid taking notice of any personalities about myself, and it would be a great pity that the Union, so well-intentioned, should at its very start be hampered and prejudiced by any personalities among or about the members. I shall pursue, as I had intended—but independently of the Union—my own course of my convictions of the labours and studies of nearly half a century. I therefore request you to allow me to withdraw from the Union. I shall watch with deep interest its proceedings, and I wish it every success in finding out the whole truth, as others have found it before.—Yours truly,

Dadabhai Naoroji.

Sir W. Wedderburn,
Palace Chambers, S.W.

THE STATEMENT OF MORAL AND MATERIAL PROGRESS.

SOME OPINIONS OF THE BRITISH PRESS.

The "Morning Post."

The India Office is probably an excellent office. It has responsibilities in connexion with the government of India which it discharges perhaps as well as could be expected. It also has a duty of mediating between the Administration of India and the British nation at home, and it makes valuable contributions towards informing the public at home of what the Government of India is doing. This work is so well done that we should like to see it done just a little better. There has just been issued the annual Blue-book entitled, "Statement exhibiting the moral and material progress and condition of India during the year 1899-1900." This statement is on a higher plane than the average Blue-book: it is clear, exact, and comprehensive. The expert who wants to know how things are going on in the particular department of the Indian Province in which he takes an interest can easily find the place, and the account given on any subject, though often brief, is always intelligible. But to the ordinary person the account is, after all, only a mass of statistics, which ends by wearying him. He would like to know how India is going on without having to read through two hundred and eighteen pages of folio. He would be glad of some help towards forming a conclusion. The citizen anxious to discharge his duty towards India, at any rate to the extent of taking an intelligent interest in the moral and material progress of that country, would be quite ready every year to read a book the size of an ordinary novel. But the object of such a book must be to convey ideas to the mind. Statistics by themselves do not convey ideas to the mind. They are materials which the magician's wand may transmute into ideas. Now we should think still more highly of that excellent institution the India Office if it made use of the magician's wand; if, instead of dumping down on the table of the House of Commons an enormous statistical treatise, it employed one of its many able writers to construct from these figures a picture of India during the year reported on, and authorised him to print his story as a book with the figures relegated to the appendix. The report as it stands is full of interesting matter, but much of it requires for the English reader a commentary showing the bearings of the facts given on India's general life. The commentary could only be supplied by men well acquainted with India and with the institutions and conditions illustrated by the figures. India is a country with an enormous population, most of whom are very poor. The population numbers close on three hundred

millions, but the net revenue is only about forty millions sterling, of which one-half is derived from taxation, most of the other half being the Government's share of the rent of all the land in India. The Government does not take on an average more than about 8 per cent. of the gross produce of the land, and it has been repeatedly declared in recent years that the taxation of India cannot well be increased. These figures, therefore, may be taken as throwing some light on the poverty of India. . . . . Collection of revenue costs four and a half millions, a large item for so small a revenue, though the same cost would probably suffice if the revenue were four or five times as great. More than two and a half millions are spent on roads and buildings, both of which are necessary, the roads being one of the greatest boons which any Government can grant. In the year under consideration two millions were spent on famine relief and insurance, an item which speaks eloquently of the poverty of the people. . . . . The principle of an annual statement on the moral and material progress of India is absolutely right. The Indian Government renders in this way its account to the British nation. But something more should be done in this country if the nation is to meet its responsibilities. We do not propose, and indeed none who have given much attention to India will propose, that Parliament should give more time to Indian affairs. Legislation at Westminster for a country so remote from our own is a delicate business, and Parliamentary interference with Indian administration has not, as a rule, been happy. But the Government of India has, and ought to have, an educating effect on our own people; it teaches them that human institutions are all relative to the nature and condition of the people who sustain them and for whose benefit they exist. We incline to the opinion that the best service that a British Legislature or a British Administration at home could render to India would be to cause the subject of India, its geography and history, to occupy a distinct place in all schemes of secondary education in this country. An English public school boy ought not to be able to finish his school days without having learned the general character of the populous country for whose welfare the British nation has become responsible. He ought to know that the Punjab and Sind are dry countries, dependent for water on the Indus and its tributaries; that the North-West Provinces and Bengal are well-watered countries, having their rains as well as their rivers; he ought to know roughly the distribution of races, religions, and families of languages in that great peninsula. Without some basis be provided in the school instruction of the average Englishman the Indian Government cannot find at home that intelligent sympathy and interest in its work which ought to be the outcome of the Imperial spirit.

The "Daily News."

The latest report on the moral and material progress of India, though it does not bring us up to the worst part of the famine period, is a cheerless document. Sir Alfred Lyall, in one of his incomparable "Asiatic Studies," makes an educated Hindu pour scorn upon the title and classification adopted in this annual report. "The India Office," he writes, "periodically issues a Blue-book purporting to describe the moral and material progress of India under British rule. Material progress is easily demonstrable. There can be no doubt that trade is flourishing, cultivation extending, and that all the industrial pursuits have increased and multiplied, while we have been taught many things that our fathers never knew. . . . . The chapter in your Blue-book which purports to register India's moral progress is still rather disappointing to me. It seems to me doubtful whether, according to the Blue-book classification, the words moral and material do not practically mean the same thing, and I fear that among Indians educated under your system there is a distinct leaning towards this interpretation." However this may be, there are no signs in the present report of material progress. Trade is not advancing, unless we reckon the increase of one per cent. over the preceding year an advance, whilst the industrial pursuits and the great industry of cultivation on which the millions of India depend for their subsistence are in a poor way. Sugar cultivation is not extending, notwithstanding the bounties which Lord Curzon introduced at Mr. Chamberlain's bidding; indigo is declining; cotton is below the average of the preceding five years; whilst the area of food grain has diminished under stress of drought by many millions of acres. The one industry that always flourishes in India is that of railway construction. The existing lines are short of rolling stock, and many of them are a deadweight on the finances of the country, but no matter what other departments may be starved or hampered for want of money, the making of railways continues on a gigantic scale. When is the Government of India going to learn that canals are more important than railways, and that moral and material progress in the East depends far more on the supply of water, where it is wanted, than on opening up the country to locomotives? People who look to this report for information on the condition of the people will go empty away. The Government of India is full of excellent intentions, but it has a way of keeping to itself the only facts on which a judgment can be formed as to whether the people are getting richer or poorer. Mr. Thorburn, a retired civilian official, declared the other day at a meeting in London that fifty millions of the Indian peasantry had been ruined by our system of revenue and Civil Courts. The report tells us nothing about that. We read the totals of the land revenue collected, and the Budget surplus is trumpeted forth as an evidence that India is doing well. Of the reverse side of the picture, the millions of struggling peasants whose lands are forfeited to the usurer or the Government, and who themselves are plunged into serfdom, we hear little or nothing. It is this side of the picture that ought to be turned to the light, and we sincerely hope that the Famine Union which has just been launched will make it its business to keep the condition of the people question to the front. For our part, we recognise to the full the good intentions and the devoted service of Lord Curzon and his colleagues in the administration of India. But when Lord Curzon tells us that the question of the readjustment of taxation is always in his mind we should like to ask him when he is going to put it into practice. When the Financial Minister refers us to his surplus he must be reminded that a surplus gathered from a starving nation is not the sort of triumph in which Englishmen can take a pride. And when we are asked to believe that the security of our great dependency is bound up with a further increase of armaments, we must insist that until the balance of expenditure is fairly struck as between ourselves and India, no further burdens should be laid upon the peasantry. The bleeding of India is the standing tragedy of our Empire, and while that goes on it is hypocrisy to issue Blue-books on moral and material progress.

"AGRICOLA REDIVIVUS."

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS ON MR. THORBURN'S PAPER.

The "Outlook."

How far practical politicians differ in respect of other questions was evidenced by the discussion of Mr. Thorburn's paper on Agricola Redivivus, read this week under the auspices of the East India Association. Mr. Thorburn is well known to be an enthusiastic lover of India and an able writer, has held high office in the Punjab, and is as positive that the recent Act of the Government of India, restricting the Punjabi cultivator's right of alienating his land, will prove a boon to that province, as Sir James Lyall, Sir Mackworth Young, Mr. Thornton, and many other high authorities are doubtful upon the point. Sir James Lyall, as ex-Lieutenant Governor, also demurred to Mr. Thorburn's statements that the Government had neglected to consider the question of agrarian indebtedness, and pointed out that until the British Government reduced the land-tax, and so left the cultivator a surplus, he escaped the money-lender, because he had nothing upon the security of which to borrow. Mr. Dutt, whose case is that the British Government has so largely increased assessments that the cultivators are impoverished to famine point, did not meet this position, or demur to Mr. Thorburn's statements that as a fact the land-tax collected by Native rulers had been very largely reduced by the British administration. The fact is that the cultivator in most tropical lands and the occidental cultivator in many countries, notwithstanding the more regular rainfall, lives near the margin of existence, and the main conditions of his life are such as Governments are powerless to change, however great their power, and however good their intentions. Much can be done to mitigate the effects of failure of the rainfall, and assuredly in this respect the British Government in India has not fallen short of previously existing standards.

The "Morning Post."

Earl Roberts, in recording after his return from India the experiences of his long career in that country, discussed briefly the existing causes of unrest and discontent among the population. One of the points to which he called attention was the extent to which, under the protection of our legal system, the peasant proprietors of India were being oppressed and ruined by village shopkeepers and money-lenders. Of these men Lord Roberts wrote that they "advance money at a most exorbitant rate of interest, taking as security the crops and occupancy rights of the cultivators of the soil. The latter are ignorant, improvident, and in some matters, such as the marriage ceremonies of their families, inordinately extravagant. The result is that a small debt soon swells into a big one, and eventually the aid of the Law Courts is evoked to oust the cultivator from a holding which in many cases has been in the possession of his ancestors for hundreds of years." The source of possible trouble to which in these words Lord Roberts called attention was particularly strong in the Punjab, where it had been investigated and a remedy suggested by Mr. Thorburn, at one time settlement officer in the Bannu district. Mr. Thorburn took much pains to prove his case by close investigation and clear exposition of the facts. He showed how large a proportion of the villagers of the Western Punjab had been dispossessed of their holdings and how the power of the money-lenders was on the increase. His plan for a remedy consisted in an alteration of the law by which the landholder should be prohibited from permanently alienating his holding except to a genuine agriculturist, and by which other limitations should be placed on the mortgaging power of the peasants. In October last a measure substantially of the nature advocated by Mr. Thorburn became law for the Punjab, and yesterday afternoon Mr. Thorburn read a paper to the East India Association explaining the origin and history of this measure. Mr. Thorburn thinks that a similar measure of protection may be needed in many other districts of India, and referred to the Deccan Rayats Act passed in 1878 by the Bombay Government as the prototype of such legislation. In the discussion which followed the paper, and in which a number of distinguished Indian administrators took part, there was a decided difference of opinion as to the wisdom of adopting in Bengal and Madras measures such as have become law for the Deccan and the Punjab. Those who opposed the scheme declared either that in the districts best known to them the peasants are not heavily indebted and need no relief, or that a law which limits their borrowing powers will do them more harm than good. Mr. Thorburn's reply was to the effect that in no district can the true state of the peasantry as regards debt and freedom from the power of the money-lender be known without an exact en-

quiry such as was made in the Punjab. The subject is one of the utmost importance to India, where the peasantry has suffered of late years so much from famine, flood, and pestilence.

THE "MORNING LEADER."

Mr. S. S. Thorburn, who a year or two ago upset so many official nerves at Simla by publicly telling the truth about the Tirah campaign, read an extremely interesting paper before the East India Association yesterday. Under the title "Agricola Redivivus" it described the events which preceded and produced the Punjab Land Alienation Act of last autumn. The object of the measure is to prevent the expropriation of small land-owners by money-lenders. To this end it prohibits the transference of land to non-agriculturists. Mr. Thorburn is certainly to be congratulated upon seeing his efforts translated into legislation, even though, as most of the speakers urged yesterday, the Act be no more than an experiment, and that, too, in a strictly limited area. Mr. Courtney, in his incisive remarks at the close, mentioned the world-wide prevalence of agricultural embarrassment. Agriculture is the oldest of all occupations, and is always being disturbed by new processes. But in India there are special causes of difficulty. Mr. Courtney referred to one of them—the collection of the land-tax with little or no relaxation or accommodation to varying circumstances. But is not this rigor itself an effect of a deeper cause—namely, the costliness of our administration? Checks upon money-lenders are good, and moderate assessments are good. But do not all discussions about economic difficulties in India bring us back at last to the root evil—the annual tribute of 30 or 40 millions to this country to pay part of the cost of an alien Government which is without doubt a stupendous and admirable fabric but, under existing methods, a greater burden than the indigent taxpayers of India can bear?

Imperial Parliament.

Tuesday, June 25.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

UNITS AWAITING RELIEF.

Mr. YERBURGH asked the Secretary of State for War whether he could state the total number of men in units now in India awaiting relief.

Lord STANLEY: The total number of men due for discharge or transfer to the Reserve up to September 30, calculation as to the total number of men in units in India awaiting relief being always made in regard to the trooping season, is about 13,500.

Monday, July 1.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIAN COTTON.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to the question recently raised in the Bombay Legislative Council with reference to the staple of Indian cotton and the bad condition in which it was brought to market: Whether he was aware that attention had been drawn to the same matter in the recent enquiries relating to famine and land revenue collections in Guzerat: And, seeing that a large proportion of the people in that province, who had suffered from the drought, were dependent upon the cultivation of cotton and its preparation for sale, whether he would consider the desirability of instituting enquiries on the spot by experienced men with the view of ascertaining the causes of the deterioration in this product, and what steps should be taken to improve the condition of this agricultural industry.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am aware that of late years the question of encouraging the cultivation of long-stapled varieties of cotton in India in place of short-stapled varieties and of otherwise improving the quality of Indian cotton has attracted attention in India. Both in Bombay and in Upper India experiments are being conducted by the Agricultural Department and efforts are being made to induce the rayat to grow improved varieties. Also I have recently asked the Government of India to inform me whether any further measures can be taken to improve the quality of Indian cotton, but at present I do not consider that any special enquiry is needed over and above what has been done by Government.

THE "MAD MULLAH."

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for War whether he had received any recent information as to the British expedition against the Mad Mullah, and could he state what was the number of British troops engaged in the campaign: Whether any officers, troops, or camp followers from India were taking part in the inland marches of the expedition, and what was the distance from the base of the operation on the coast to the Mullah's stronghold; whether the expedition was under the direction of the Foreign Office or of the Colonial Office; And, whether the Political Agent of the Government of India at Aden or Berbera had taken part in the arrangements of the expedition.

Viscount CRANBORNE: Information was received on June 22 and communicated to the daily papers on June 25 to the effect that the Mullah had been defeated and was in flight. The British force had returned to Bohotele to await instructions. There are no British troops engaged in the campaign; the force consists of a Native levy of 1,500 Somalis under British officers; with 50 Indian Punjabis as instructors under Major Beynon. There are also a number of tribal spearmen. With the exception of these Punjabis there are no Indian troops or followers with the expedition. The distance from the base at Berbera to Samasa, where the Mullah was defeated, is approximately 190 miles. The expedition is under the Foreign Office. The Somaliland Protectorate is now administered by the Foreign Office through Colonel Sadler, his Majesty's Consul-General at Berbera. Papers relating to the expedition are about to be laid on the table.

Tuesday, July 2.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TIBET.

Mr. NORMAN asked the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, seeing that the so-called Tibetan Embassy had reached St. Petersburg and was about to be received by his Majesty the Tsar, he could now give the House any information upon the subject, and would he state whether any communication concerning this so-called embassy had been addressed to the Russian Government.

Viscount CRANBORNE: We have heard that a mission from Tibet has arrived in Russia, but we are without detailed information as to its character. His Majesty's Government have not addressed any communication to the Russian Government on the subject.

Mr. NORMAN asked if the noble lord was in a position to state whether he would be able at a future time to make a statement on the subject.

Viscount CRANBORNE: Perhaps the hon. Member will put down a question on the subject.

EXCHANGE COMPENSATION ALLOWANCE.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had given orders that claims advanced by public servants in India for compensation allowance, under regulations he had sanctioned, were to be finally decided by the Government of India except in cases where new or doubtful points were raised which were not covered by the rules; whether this limitation on the right of appeal to the Secretary of State from decisions of the Government of India was intended to apply to cases in which that Government failed or declined to inform the claimant on what point or points under the rules they held him not to be entitled to compensation: And, whether, in any case when the Government of India failed or refused to state the grounds of its decision to any officer who appealed to it under these or any other regulations, he would allow such officer to submit his case directly to the Secretary of State for revision.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The Government of India have been authorised to give a final decision upon all cases of exchange compensation allowance which are provided for in the regulations approved by the Secretary of State. But if any officer memorialises the Secretary of State against the refusal of the Government of India to give reasons for a decision in which he is concerned, then, whether that decision relates to a case of exchange compensation or to any other matter, his memorial will be dealt with under the general rules applicable to memorials, and may or may not be forwarded to the Secretary of State according to the merits of the case.

INDIAN STAFF OFFICERS.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to the fact that a Cavalry officer of the Indian Staff Corps had by regulation to take on service four personal attendants, viz., one body servant and three syces, and that the cost of extra clothing for these servants for the China campaign had amounted to about Rs. 286, or more than a month's pay for a subaltern: And, whether the German officers in China had an extra allowance of £1 per day, and whether any decision had yet been arrived at by the War Office in regard to the question of a supplementary allowance to Indian Staff Officers serving in China on account of the extra expenses entailed upon them; and, if not, when a decision might be expected.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am aware that a Cavalry officer has to take four servants with him on active service; but I do not know what was the cost of their outfit on this occasion. I am informed that the German officers were granted for this China Expedition a special "equipment allowance" according to rank. For subalterns it was about 10s. a day. British officers with the expedition have been granted special concessions on account of quarters, fuel, and lighting; and in Hong Kong and Shanghai an extra sum on account of the high cost of living generally.

Thursday, July 4.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FACILITIES FOR TAKING LEAVE.

Mr. BARTLEY asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would take into consideration the proposal that much greater facilities at reduced charges should be given to officers and selected men in the Army, as a reward, to enable them to come to England for three months' leave at intervals during their career in India: Whether this could be arranged by affording them facilities on vessels returning or on specially chartered vessels: And, whether, with the view of improving by such an arrangement the health and consequent efficiency of the Army in India and increasing its popularity, he would cause an experiment to be made to carry out this proposal.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I should be glad if the facilities for taking leave could be increased with due regard to the requirements of the service and without imposing any undue charge on Indian revenues. But the question which the hon. Member has raised is a large one, and could only be considered in consultation not only with the Government of India, but also with the War Office, as it is closely connected with the grant of leave to soldiers serving abroad in other parts of the Empire. I will not lose sight of the subject.

PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO INDIA.

To be obtained from
THE BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84-85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

Reports of the Proceedings at the Annual Sessions of the Indian National Congress, from the 3rd to the 14th Session. 2s. each, post free.

The Skeleton at the (Jubilee) Feast (Congress Green Book I.), by Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN, Bart. (being a series of suggestions for the prevention of famine in India). Post free, 7d.

Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure: Evidence-in-Chief of the Indian Witnesses. (Congress Green Book II.) Post free, 1s. 10d.

The Proposed Separation of Judicial and Executive Functions in India. Memorial to the Secretary of State. With two Appendices. (Congress Green Book III.) Post free, 1s. 2d.

Two Statements presented to the Indian Currency Committee (1898), by Mr. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

Speech by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., in the House of Commons, August 14, 1894, on the Debate on the Indian Budget.

Ditto do. in the House of Commons, February 12, 1895, on the Debate on the Address.

Ditto do. on British Rule in India (1898).

Presidential Address by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., delivered to the Indian National Congress at Lahore, 1893.

Presidential Address by Mr. A. M. Bose, M.A., delivered to the Indian National Congress at Madras, 1898.

Speeches of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., President of the Indian National Congress, 1894-5.

Valedictory Address of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., delivered at Bombay, January 17, 1895.

Speeches of Mr. D. E. Wacha delivered at the 9th, 11th and 14th Sessions of the Indian National Congress.

Is the Government of India Responsible to Anyone, and if so to Whom? Speech delivered at Croydon by Mr. W. C. BONNERJEE.

The Famine in India. Speeches delivered at a Public Reception to Mr. Vaughan Nash on his return from the Famine Districts, July, 1900.

Mr. A. O. Hume's Farewell to India. Speech delivered at Bombay, 1894.

India Reform Pamphlet IX. The State and Government of India under its Native Rulers. 3d.

The Indian National Congress: its Aims and Justification. By ROBERT KNIGHT.

Indian Politics. A Series of Papers on Important Indian Questions by Prominent Congressmen. Post free, 4s. 4d

A Needed Reform in the Indian Administration, by ROMESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.

The Bogey of a Russian Invasion. A Lesson from the Tirah Campaign, by Col. H. B. HANNA.

The High Courts and the Collector-Magistrates in India, by J. DACOSTA.

The Government of India and its Reform through Parliamentary Institutions, by J. DACOSTA.

Note on Sir J. Westland's Budget, 1894-5.

Note on the Explanatory Memorandum of the Secretary of State for India, 1894-5.

Note on Sir James Westland's Budget, 1895-6.

Note on Sir H. Waterfield's Tables, 1884-5 to 1894-5.

The Poor Man's Lamb: Famine Insurance for the Masses *versus* Exchange Compensation for the Classes.

REPRINTS FROM "INDIA."

The Judiciary and the Executive in India. Interview with Mr. Manomohan Ghose.

The Bombay Government and Higher Education, by the Hon. C. H. Setalved.

A National Famine Grant, Letter from the London Indian Society to Lord Salisbury, 1900.

India and the General Election (1900).

"Melancholy Meanness."

The "Over-population" Fallacy Again.

No National Contribution?

The "Slimness" of the India Office.

"Mainly a Question of Money."

A Selection of the Publications enumerated above will be forwarded to responsible persons or Associations in the United Kingdom for gratuitous distribution, on written application to the British Committee, Indian National Congress, 84-85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS to "INDIA" 1901.

WHY NOT SUBSCRIBE NOW?

A limited number of new Subscribers can still be supplied with copies of INDIA from the beginning of the present year. SUBSCRIPTIONS (POST FREE) SIX RUPEES.

PREPAID Subscriptions for the REMAINDER OF THE YEAR should be remitted direct to the Office in London at the following rates, which include postage:—

June 1 to end of year..4 rupees.
July 1 to end of year..3 rupees 8 annas.

Do you want to know by every mail what has been done in Parliament concerning India?

Do you want to see special reports of public meetings in England concerning India?

Do you want to read what the British Press is writing about India?

———*The Journal "INDIA" will tell you.*

Remittances should accompany every order.
Address:—THE MANAGER OF "INDIA,"
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS,
WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

"THE PEOPLE OF INDIA:

Their Many Merits by Many who have Known Them."

Mr. Alfred Webb's articles reprinted in pamphlet form from "INDIA."

A copy will be sent free on receipt of 1d. stamp to cover postage.

Secretaries of Political Associations, Clubs, Literary Societies, in the United Kingdom may obtain copies for distribution on application.

BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

In India, applications should be addressed to
MR. HARICHANDRA A. TALCHERKAR,
52, Veronica Street, Bandra, Bombay.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.

Subscription in England:—
July 1 to End of Year (Post free), 5s.

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2 Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.